Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL NOTES ON NEW AND OLD GENERA OF PLANTS.—III.

BY J. A. NIEUWLAND.

Chlorophyllum.

A rather unusual oversight, such in fact as one would scarcely expect in modern biological nomenclature is the case of the fungus name *Chlorophyllum*. Rafinesque on occasion had published a name and afterward quite unaware apparently or forgetful of his own previous publication thereof used it a second time for an altogether different plant.[1] In volume 9, p. 172 of the North American Flora,[2] Murrill founded a new genus of fungi from Guiana on *Neurophyllum viride* Pat. which he called *Chlorophyllum*, and in the same work, volume 10, p. 64[3] there appears another *Chlorophylum* Mass.[4] a plant not only in the same family but also the type from the same country. It is perfectly evident that in a work as well prepared as the North American Flora the two can not be expected to merit survival under the same name. That of Massey seems to possess priority and another designation is demanded for Murrill's *Chlorophyllum*. Even in mycology where the nomenclature has not been as exactly and exhaustively systematized by any means as in the case of the ferns and phanerogams, exemplified by the Index of Christensen and Kew, one could hardly have looked for a mistake like the above mentioned, and in the Flora at that. Such oversights are, however, easily made, and without blame to any extent on the part of either author or editor, so difficult a matter is the perfect editing of a work of the scope and pretensions of this Flora.

The name *Chlorophyllum* is a name especially for a chlorophylless plant, nor even a real leafy one is hardly a good one for either, nor is the use of a name already used in botany as the latin equivalent of the functioning photosynthetic "organ" of plant food elaboration to be recommended as applicable to systematic entity or genus. To replace the antedated name we may suggest *Murrillia.*[1] Following is the synonymy:

---

[1] See Am. Mid. Nat. I, p. 238 (1910).

[2] Feb. 3 (1910).

[3] July 28 (1914).

[4] Massey, Kew. Bull. p. 136 (1898).

Murrillia Nom. nov.

Chlorophyllum Murrill, N. Am. Fl. 9, p. 172 (1910) not *Chlorophyllum* Massey, Kew Bull. p. 136 (1898).

Chlorophyllum viride Murrill l. c. *Neurophyllum viride* Pat. Jour. de Bot. 2, p. 406 (1888).

Phragmites.

The name *Phragmites* Trin.[2] is still retained by our manual makers, ad that in spite of their rules that do not tolerate the retention of a name that had been previously used for another plant whether in the judgment of present day nomenclators the first named plant deserved valid generic standing or not. There already existed a different or doubtful *Phragmites* [3]Adans., equialent to *Sorghum* Linn.(?) more or less modified. The oldest designation of a plant included in the genus, by a separate designation, is perhaps *Trichoon* Roth.[4] Even if this be inapplicable the other available names are either doubtfully used, such as *Czernya* Presl[5] or possibly attempts at further segregation from *Phragmites* Trin. itself as perhaps in case of *Oxyanthe* Steudel.[6] In fact, it may not be altogether certain that *Trichoon* is unobjectionable, though it at least seems to be prior. If Adanson's name is not at least doubtfully applied then why is not the name attributed to him? May perhaps the following be suggested as synonymy?

Trichoon[7] Roth, l. c.(1798).

Phragmites Trin. l. c. (1820) not *Phragmites* Adans. l. c. (1763) *Ceryna* (?) Presl, l. c. (1818), *Oxyanthe* Steudel, l. c. (1855) (?).

Trichoon Phragmites (Linn.) nov. comb.

Arundo Phragmites Linn., Sp. Pl., p. 81 (1753), *Phragmites communis* Trin. l. c. (1820) *Oxyanthe Phragmites* (Linn.) (?)?.

---

[1] It may be possible that even the name *Murrillia* be preoccupied and in such case *Murrillomyces* alternatively suggested.

[2] Trinius, K. B., Fund. Agrost. p. 134 (1820).

[3] Adanson, M. Fam. des Pl., II, p. 34 (1763).

[4] Roth, Roem., Arch. I, III, p. 37 (1798).

[5] Presl., K. B., Gram. Sic. p. 23 (1818).

[6] Steudel, E., Syn. Pl. Gram. p. 197 (1855).

[7] Should none of the aforementioned names be applicable and a new one demanded, we suggest *Miphragtes.*

Pp. 287–310 and plates IV–X published July 17, 1914.